



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CD
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,070	11/13/2001	Scott F. McCarty	15362.1.4.1	8174
21552	7590	10/11/2006	EXAMINER	
			JUNG, DAVID YIUK	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	
DATE MAILED: 10/11/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/010,070	MCCARTY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Y. Jung	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2002.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/02
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

CLAIMS PRESENTED

Claims 1-39 are presented.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Overview (Novell Single Sign-On, pp. 1-6, April, 1999, cited by Applicant).

Regarding claim 1, Overview teaches "In a system comprising a plurality of external systems and an integration module for facilitating communication with the plurality of external systems, a method for coordinating the termination of a session on at least one of the plurality of external systems, the method comprising: upon a user selecting to terminate a session on an integration module, identifying one or more external systems of a plurality of external systems upon which a user has an active session (section "How it all works", i.e. single sign on access); transmitting a de-authentication ... to the one or more external systems to terminate the active session on the one or more external systems; and upon delivering

the de-authentication ... to each of the one or more external systems, terminating the session on the integration module (section "Secure Management through NDS", i.e., session oriented security, the tunnel is torn down)."

These passages of Overview do not teach "request" in the sense of the claim.

Nevertheless, it was well known in the art to have a "request" situation among networks for the motivation of having control across networks.

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to modify Overview for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 1-12, these features are well known in the art for the motivation of security.

Regarding claim 13, such "graphical user interface", etc. are well known in the art for the motivation of providing convenient access for the user.

Regarding claims 14-24, these claims are computer product analogs of claims 1-8, 10-13 (system claims). For the reasons stated in the rejections of claims 1-8, 10-13, claims 13-24 are unpatentable.

Regarding claim 25, Overview teaches "In a system comprising an external system and an integration module for facilitating communication with the external system, a method for coordinating terminating a session on the external system and the integration module, the method comprising: displaying a ... to a user, the ... facilitating the user in creating active sessions on an integration module and an external module (section "How it all works", i.e. single sign on access); upon the user

selecting to terminate an active session on the integration module through the graphical user interface, identifying the external system upon which the user has created the active session; transmitting a de-authentication ... to the external system to terminate the active session on the external system; and upon delivering the de-authentication ... to the external system, terminating the session on the integration module(section “Secure Management through NDS”, i.e., session oriented security, the tunnel is torn down).

These passages of Overview do not teach “graphical user interface” in the sense of the claim.

Nevertheless, it was well known in the art to have a “graphical user interface” for the motivation of providing convenient access for the user.

Also, these passages of Overview do not teach “request” in the sense of the claim.

Nevertheless, it was well known in the art to have a “request” situation among networks for the motivation of having control across networks.

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to modify Overview for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 26-34, the various features are well known in the art for the motivation of security. Regarding claims 35-38, these features (credentialing, etc.) are well known in the art for the motivation of security.

Art Unit: 2134

Regarding claim 39, this claim is same as claim 1 except for the user module. Such user modules are well known in the art for the motivation of providing convenient access to the user.

Conclusion

The art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The art disclosed general background.

Points of Contact

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

Art Unit: 2134

(571) 273-3836 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or
"DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Jung whose telephone number is (571) 272-3836 or Jacques Louis-Jacques whose telephone number is (571) 272-6962.

David Jung

Patent Examiner



10/1/06